DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 825 SP 014 542

AUTHOR Schneider, Barbara L.
TITLE Identifying Future Research and Training Programs for University-Based Secondary Education Departments.
INSTITUTION Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 79
CONTRACT 300-79-0250
NOTE 43p.; Conference held at Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois, May 1979) ; Research prepared in cooperation with The Dean's Network

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Curriculum Development; *Educational Research; Evaluation Methods; Feasibility Studies; *Needs Assessment; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Research Utilization; *Secondary Education; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

A consortium of 39 schools, colleges, and departments of education along with representatives of the Office of Education convened to study the salient problems in secondary teacher education. Areas of interest included: the working cooperation between administrators and faculty; the development of new curricula despite declining enrollment; the nature and responsiveness of the interface between department and community at large; and the revision of promotion criteria. The feasibility of various preservice training programs and the mechanisms for transposing research data into practical application were also discussed. The role of government and the problems encountered in federal funding were explored. Conferees participated in a series of case studies. Results centered on the use of research, the service component in education, and the teacher evaluation methods discussed earlier in the conference. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175825

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Barbara L. Schneider
The Deans' Network
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Final Report

on the

Conference

IDENTIFYING FUTURE RESEARCH AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

for

University-based Secondary Education Departments

Cosponsored by

The Deans' Network

and

The Office of Education
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education

This project was partially funded by the Office of Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education and was performed pursuant to Contract No. 300-79-0250. The points of view expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

May, 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 014 542

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of the Planning Committee, Robert L. Church, Associate Dean, School of Education, Northwestern University; C. Benjamin Cox, Professor and Chairman, Secondary Education Department, College of Education, University of Illinois-Urbana; Jack Elliot, Chairman, Department of Science, Prospect High School, Mount Prospect, Illinois; William Gardner, Dean, College of Education, University of Minnesota-Minneapolis; Jean Grambs, Professor, Department of Secondary Education University of Maryland; Julie Grosh, Director, Student Teaching, College of Education, University of Illinois-Urbana; James Raths, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois-Urbana; and Richard L. Turner, Dean, School of Education, University of Colorado, for their time and effort in developing the theme and activities for this conference. Particularly, I would like to thank Associate Dean James Raths, the author of the Case Study, for his immeasurable assistance in making this a successful conference, and his colleagues, C. Benjamin Cox and Julie Grosh. In addition, I would like to thank Ruth Graf, my administrative assistant for her assistance in the planning, organizing, and arranging the conference, David Osberg, and Bob Young, graduate students in the School of Education, Northwestern University, for their assistance and contributions to the conference. Finally, I would like to thank Mary Bucholtz for typing this manuscript. The inadequacies of this report, however, remain my own.

Barbara L. Schneider
Director
The Deans' Network

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

FINAL REPORT

Introduction 1

Summary of the Conference Proceedings 5

A Review of the Case Studies 13

Several Broad Approaches to Research Frontiers in Secondary Education 34

Evaluation of the Impact of the Conference on the Participants. 37

Recommendations for Future Activities 39

INTRODUCTION

The Deans' Network, a consortium of thirty-nine schools/colleges/departments of education located in major multipurpose, graduate level universities in the country, recently cosponsored a conference with the Office of Education on, "Identifying Future Research and Training Programs for University-based Secondary Education Departments" at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana Campus. The theme for this conference originated from a concern among the deans on how to continue to support quality research and training programs in secondary education departments during present times of fiscal constraint and declining enrollments. Among the Network membership are intellectual leaders in the secondary education field. These deans and faculty members play an important role in the training of secondary school teachers and administrators, conducting research in secondary schools, and consulting with federal, state, and local education agencies, and other organizations concerning secondary school issues. In pursuing this role, it became apparent to several of the deans and faculty members that strategies should be formulated so that universities could continue to maintain quality secondary education departments. Recognizing the difficulty of the task, a planning committee was established (a list of the committee can be found in Appendix A) to organize a program that would address these concerns.

The original planning committee consisted of several deans who began discussions on what they considered to be the most pressing problems in secondary education departments. The deans decided that the effectiveness of the program would be improved if faculty were involved in determining the conference theme and relevant activities. Consequently, the planning committee was reconstituted

to include several faculty, deans, and representatives from the public schools.

Several assumptions governed the deliberations of the committee in designing the program. The first assumption was that problems in secondary education departments are systemic. This is due in part to the disciplinary focus of the faculty. Generally, secondary education faculty have frequent communications with colleagues in their discipline; however, few of them have ties with secondary education faculty outside their specialized area. This disciplinary focus tends to isolate secondary education faculty. Moreover, this effect contributes to the difficulty of providing a comprehensive training of professionals for the increasingly complex high school of today. Therefore, the first priority of the committee was to develop a mechanism whereby a secondary education inter- and intra-university network could be established.

The concentration on a disciplinary focus in the training program was not considered by the planning committee as undesirable. However, several of the members suggested that the disciplinary focus should be augmented by courses and programs directly involved with the field that discussed the psychological and sociological development of adolescents and management teaching techniques. These comments spurred an interest on the part of the committee to develop an activity that would examine the relevance and quality of secondary education training programs.

The second assumption related to the mission of the Deans' Network. The major goal of the Network is to continually increase knowledge development by stimulating and enhancing scholarly productivity. In keeping with this theme, the committee wanted to create an activity that would assist researchers in studying the complex issues in our secondary schools. The intent was to generate broad integrative approaches to complex problems rather than to reiterate findings

from existing research. Thus the committee decided that whatever type of activity was proposed, time and an appropriate forum would be given to discuss new research directions.

Recognizing these assumptions, the committee agreed that the most effective means for clarifying some of the problems in secondary education departments was to organize a small invitational meeting where secondary education faculty could meet and discuss similar concerns. The theme of this meeting would be to examine some of the common organizational issues in secondary education departments and identify new research frontiers in secondary education. To accomplish these objectives, it was decided that the Network would host a three-day conference at a Network institution.

The purpose of the conference was to have the deans and secondary education faculty address the systemic problems facing secondary education, and to attempt to share some solutions to those problems. The committee felt that there should be ample opportunities for discussion, and it was decided that all of the conferees would share in identifying problems and solutions. The conference was designed to actively involve participants through work sessions, simulations, and evaluation sessions. (For the agenda of the conference, see Appendix B.)

Over one hundred invitations were sent to all the Network deans, chairpersons of secondary education departments, faculty members, and adminstrators and secondary school teachers who are involved in cooperative university programs. (For a list of the conferees, see Appendix C.) The planning committee felt that it was extremely important that the Network deans, as educational leaders, be involved in the conference. Should recommendations be considered to modify or change an existing program, the perspectives of the deans would be critical. The rationale for inviting school personnel was based on the belief that a constant

concern of secondary education faculty is their relationships with the field. In trying to be more responsive to the field, the committee felt that secondary school people should be encouraged to participate in the conference so that the suggested changes would be relevant to the environment in which universities were training teachers to work.

As this conference was developed to meet several criteria, this report is organized in the following sections: 1) summary of the conference proceedings; 2) review of the case studies including recommendations and revised plans based on later evaluation sessions; 3) synthesis of the broad approaches to research frontiers highlighted at the conference; 4) evaluation of the impact of the conference on the participants based on two evaluation techniques; and 5) recommendations for future activities.

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Sunday Evening

The Conference was convened Sunday evening by C. Benjamin Cox, Chair. Secondary Education Department, University of Illinois-Urbana. After an informal dinner, the participants were organized in small groups for a case study simulation. Each group was asked to assume they were participating in a secondary education department faculty meeting within a large research oriented university. The groups were given two tasks for which they were asked to respond in a written memorandum to the dean. The tasks included: 1) proposing new faculty positions for the department; 2) identifying new programs in the face of declining enrollment; 3) evaluating community requests for departmental intervention; and 4) revising promotion criteria. The reports containing the groups' recommendations were compiled, reproduced, and distributed to a select panel for review and comments the following morning.

Monday Morning

Lawrence Metcalf, Secondary Education Department, University of Illinois-Urbana, introduced the speakers and chaired the morning proceedings. The panel members included: J. Myron Atkin, Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois-Urbana; Norman Frey, Chair., English Department, New Trier East High School, Winnetka, Illinois; Joseph M. Cronin, State Superintendent of Education, Illinois; Philip Schlechty, Professor and Chairman, Organization Development and Instructional Services, School of Education, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and Vernon Smith, Alternative Schools Network, School of Education, Indiana University. The panel members were asked to react to the case studies according to each member's role, i.e., dean, chair., or professor.

The first reviewer, J. Myron Atkin, Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois-Urbana, described some of the external and internal factors that

affect secondary education departments. One of the factors impacting on schools of education is the influence of teacher groups. As teachers seek greater control over the professions, the current intellectual base is likely to change. As an example, the National Education Association's emphasis on field experiences in teacher education has affected certification requirements, resulting in several implications for training programs. Recognizing that the teacher education program can only absorb a limited number of courses and activities, there are serious priorities that must be established. Training programs emphasizing increased field work may result in a reduction in the number of required university courses.

In reference to continuing education, the role of the university is also changing as a result of organized teacher influence. The collective bargaining process has had a tremendous influence on institutions of higher education by rewarding continuing education credits and advanced degrees. One way for the institutions of higher education to respond to teacher demand is to produce shorter, more intensive courses that retrain and foster new scholarship. This new scholarship must be communicated in common sense language to school people.

Internal factors that have affected secondary teacher training programs include 1) the emphasis of universities on research and 2) a change in perceptions among faculty concerning the appropriateness of a single disciplinary focus for training. In a number of universities there has been an increase in research productivity. To remain synchronous with the goals and activities of these research universities, the teacher training programs have had to reflect the concerns of the research university. In respect to the second factor, at the secondary level there seems to be a need to develop new scholarly approaches to deal with the complex problems in high schools. This would mean that the training programs should cut across single disciplines and look at the interrelationships among several fields of study.

Norman Frey, Chair., English Department, New Trier East High School, Winnetka, Illinois, examined four issues in reference to the case study: 1) faculty appointments, 2) student teaching programs, 3) relations with the field, and 4) research directions. Faculty appointments should reflect concern with the education process and the field field-based study of schools. Faculty members should have strong research and theoretical expertise. Secondary education training programs should be based on criteria that provide for excellence in teaching. Student Teaching programs should be revised to cushion the "culture shock" some teachers experience when they assume classroom responsibilities. The preparation program should be based on a common sense approach, recognizing that people have different teaching styles.

To increase cooperation with the field, Mr. Frey suggested that a secondary school faculty member be given a joint appointment to work with the schools and teach courses at the university. This type of faculty position would ennance the service opportunities of secondary education departments. Mr. Frey maintained that the supervision of student teachers and relationships with the field should be the responsibility of all professors in a secondary education department. Overall, the effectiveness of teachers would be enhanced by a long term policy of greater cooperation between the field and the university. Pertaining to research, Mr. Frey suggested that we should concentrate on broad-based research that involves teachers, identifying locally based school problems and teacher evaluation.

The next panelist was Joseph Cronin, State Superintendent of Education, Illinois. His presentation, in contrast to the other presenters, was more optimistic relative to the market possibilities for secondary school teachers and the role of the universities in the preparation process. His optimism was based on several points: 1) rising enrollments in elementary schools which will eventually

be reflected in the high schools; 2) stabilizing SAT test scores which will most likely go up, encouraging a return of confidence in the schools by the general public; 3) increasing state and federal dollars for inservice education, which will trickle down to the colleges and universities. Dr. Cronin's "Caveats and Concerns" included: 1) universities are not very good at delivering technical assistance; 2) universities are good at maintaining an intellectual base; 3) instruction is an important mission of the university; research is a condition of promotion, and service activites have a low priority; and 4) the university is not responsive to the junior high and middle school needs.

Philip Schlechty, Professor, School of Education, University of North Carolina, advocated several ideas for the operation and focus of secondary education departments. Currently, there are few faculty committees for research or positions for clinical professorships. This is unfortunate because they provide fertile opportunities for publication and experimentation. The integration of the university within field-based schools must involve conferring with teachers and principals to establish program and teaching standards. This may require the revamping of current reward structures and reconsideration of professional organization autonomy. By offering the services of the university to local school districts, relationships are developed which hold future payoffs in the extension of educational research.

Vernon Smith, Alternative Schools Network, School of Education, Indiana University, concluded the morning presentations by commenting on current trends and future possibilities for secondary schools. By 1980, the major formal education of youths and adults will take place outside of traditional schools. Secondary education departments need to be responsive to this trend. Media pressure to return to education's "glorious past," the back to basics movement, and

minimum competency seem to indicate a reallignment of the purpose of schooling. A change in focus of education should include examination of the educational process, dissemination of findings, and ongoing re-evaluation.

Monday Afternoon

Monday's luncheon speaker was Thomas Minter, Deputy Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Office of Education. Dr. Minter's remarks were addressed to the federal effort in funding programs related to secondary education. Numerous examples were cited, and an optimistic view of future trends in financial support directly or indirectly assisting schools of education was given. These included Equal Education, Title VII, Civil Rights, Compensatory Education, Guidance and Counseling, Library, Municipal, Environmental Education, Migrant Education, Indo-Chinese Refugee Education, and Alcohol and Drug Programs.

Dr. Minter maintained that the government provides a forum for identifying issues and sharing information. Research interests of the Office of Education include alolescent learning, class size, and teacher training. Other interests of the Office include the urban high school, international education, and basic skill instruction.

Dr. Minter asked, "Why, with our great knowledge and skill, is educational excellence so elusive?" If we step away from education, other foci can help to solve some of our problems. These include economic, social, class and political factors which should be taken into consideration when establishing program priorities. Another element for achieving educational excellence is to build strong relationships among the federal agencies and institutions of higher education to effect mutually desired outcomes.

The afternoon session, chaired by James Raths, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois-Urbana, focused on "Research Frontiers in Secondary Education." James Rosenbaum, Associate Professor, Department of Social

Psychology, Yale University, reviewed research on ability grouping. He suggested that new models and new departures in research be applied to the established practices. Problems exist with the "ability grouping" label which should be addressed. Does ability grouping produce homogeneous groups or have an effect on teaching methods? How do we measure instructional differences? Does an ability grouping assignment affect other school programs? Are the selected students afforded ample flexibility of movement? New variables may throw light on old perplexing problems. Other areas would benefit from this type of research, i.e., grading, attendance, extra-curricular activities, class size, and modular timing.

Norman Sprintall, Professor, College of Education, University of Minnesota, suggested that recent developments of theory and practice in human development may be used by those who would seek to reform secondary education. Given that it has been shown that students may forget half of what they have learned after one year of a narrowly defined curriculum approach, and that academic achievement does not predict success in life, other avenues need to be researched. He suggested that the concept of "psychological maturity," for which more than two hundred indices have been developed, is a better predictor of success. Current efforts in this direction show considerable promise. In addition, Sprintall asserted that regular high school programs can be developed to provide psychological maturity for adolescents. He called for the development of curricula combining learning by doing with an emphasis on reflections on learning and understanding over a broad array of experiences. He urged going into the classroom "where the action is," and giving up the idolatry of the intellect.

Dr. Susan Abramowitz, Associate Director, Educational Finance, National Institute of Education, discussed a national study on high schools by NIE entitled, High School 1977. The basic assumption that high schools are bureaucratic and authoritarian may be inaccurate. The study surveyed 2000 public schools and 600

private school principals with 75% response rate. The results revealed that high school are like sponges absorbing community demands. The three tiered structure of principals, staff, and decision makers indicated that management linkages to instruction were non-existent and that the organizations were indeed non-bureaucratic. These conclusions would indicate a new approach to change in high schools, where participatory democracy is at work.

Thomas Popkewitz, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, emphasized the study of schools as social constructions and urged that stress be placed on the social processes of schooling. He urged that researchers probe beneath the surface of educational institutions and processes for underlying meanings and the dynamics of social issues. He outlined three dimensions of school institutional life: school as a place of work which should enhance students' self-control of work; school as a place where knowledge is transmitted through pedagogy; and school as a place where the notion of professionalism is used as a way of creating an aura of respect and trust.

Monday Evening

To continue with the informal format of the Conference, the Secondary Education Department of the College of Education, University of Illinois, arranged for the conferees to have dinner at various faculty homes. Five dinner parties were given by the University of Illinois Secondary Education faculty. This afforded the conferees another opportunity to discuss their concerns in small groups with participants from other institutions.

Tuesday Morning

On Tuesday, the participants were asked to return to their original groups to review their Sunday night case study reports in light of the conference presentations. After a short work sessions, the conferees assembled to hear the summary

remarks of Jean Grambs, Department of Secondary Education, University of Maryland. Dr. Grambs expressed optimism for the future of departments of secondary education. She advocated a push for renewed vitality, more insights into the sociology of the system, and more information sharing with the deans of the schools of education. She urged more thorough field training of prospective teachers. Moreover, she maintained that professors of secondary education should spend more time in schools helping translate the fruits of research into practice and solve locally based school problems using their particular training, expertise, and experience.

During the wrap-up discussion, there seemed to emerge a feeling that more conferences such as this would be beneficial. The conferees stated that it was useful for professional colleagues to exchange ideas and share interests within and across disciplines. It was suggested that more representatives from secondary schools,as well as deans of schools of education, would enrich the exchange. A working conference might contribute to the creation of new directions and goals for schools of education.

REVIEW OF THE CASE STUDIES

Introduction

On Sunday evening the participants were organized into eight groups. Each group included approximately ten members representing a cross section (e g., deans, faculty members, school personnel, etc.) of the conference participants. All of the groups received a case study which described a secondary education department in a large research oriented university. (For a copy of the case study, see Appendix D.)

The participants were asked to assume that they were members of a secondary education department similar to the one described in the materials. The session was a faculty meeting called to deal with two problems. The first task was mandatory, the second task was to be selected from a list of several options. Each group was asked to make a decision in the form of a memorandum to the dean, stating justifications for the decision in outline form. The groups had approximately one and a half hours to work on the solutions. The completed memoranda were collected and distributed to a panel for review. On Monday morning responses to case studies were reviewed by a select panel. (For a detailed description of the reviews, see pages 5 -9 .) Tuesday morning the small groups were reconvened and asked to revise their memoranda in light of conference presentations.

The results of the case studies are organized as follows: 1) the tasks are described as they were presented to the group; 2) the responses of the first evening are summarized; 3) the initial responses are compared to the revisions made on Tuesday morning. These comparisons are analyzed according to changes in process, content, and role identification.

Task I

> Professor Sidney Marland has decided to retire at the end of the year. In addition, Philip Nolan has accepted a position with a non-profit corporation and has resigned from the University. The dean has suggested that the department can keep the two lines being vacated if they make "reasonable" suggestions for replacements. The department is to decide: what positions should we request from the dean?

Initial Recommendations

Group A began by deciding that the first priority was to reach consensus on the mission of an R & D institution. They agreed that the focus of such an institution should be the study of schools, teaching, and teacher education. To enhance this activity, the faculty should participate in this process. A major strength of secondary education departments has been and will continue to be faculty who specialize in the academic curricula, whereas the preparation of undergraduates and the inservice of classroom teachers should be the baseline activities. In an R & D institution, the faculty need to study the educational process and teach people to think about education. If the goal of the school is the study of education, the department needs new faculty with specific skills. It was therefore proposed that the replacement for Professor Marland not only have a specialty in mathematics education, but equally important, that he or she be moving in the broader direction of the study of schools. This individual should have the capacity to provide the faculty with research skills that are necessary to take a new look at schools. The second position, a replacement for Professor Nolan, should be an individual who has had a background in a variety of school and other educational settings. This individual should possess a strong field-

based research capability, reflecting sociological and/or anthropological perspectives.

The two new faculty will be teamed with Professor Dewey, the curriculum and teacher education generalist, to begin the process of identifying research possibilities, including the active solicitation of funding for the sutdy of teaching. These three individuals will be asked to develop plans for involving other faculty.

Group D and E (two groups were combined into one group) decided that they needed to make some assumptions before they could write their memorandum. The assumptions were: 1) student enrollment in the secondary education department has declined more severely in English, Social Studies, and foreign languages than it has in math, science, and other areas. The following distribution of students exists at the undergraduate level: English 17, Social Studies 16, Science 10, Mathematics 7, Speech 6, Foreign Languages 6, Music 5, Art Education 3; totaling 70 students. (The English and Social Studies areas had considerably more students in 1973 than in 1978.) 2) Alva Edison, one of the two Science professors, will be retiring in two more years; 3) three of the important goals of the Department are: a) improving the absolute and relative position within the College in obtaining research grants, b) clarifying the needs of the school districts surrounding the university in terms of profession consulting, c) tying the needs of the school districts to research efforts and competition for grants, and 4) the malaise of the Department is so strong that new leadership is desired by the majority of the faculty. Based on these assumptions, Group D and E made the following recommendations.

The Department should seek a person whose main strength is mathematics education with supporting strengths in Science Education and Computer Science. This person will be working on growing course work in computer education for local school personnel. It is anticipated this will begin the development of a stronger re-

liance of the public schools on the university for consulting work. This new faculty member will be hired as an assistant professor and be full-time in the College of Education, rather than a joint appointment. The vote on the description for this new faculty member was seven for, one against.

The second faculty member should have a proven track record in obtaining grants and contracts. The role of this faculty member would be to establish outreach programs and assist faculty members who would become interested in new directions for the College. Teaching requirements would be part-time because part of the new position's responsibility would be the in-service programs for the 14 other members in the department. The person may come from a government background but should have significant experience in the public schools as a teacher and administrator. The new faculty member should have administrative talents at the university level, and be a likely candidate for the new department chairman. This position would be offered as full professor. The vote on the description of this faculty member was seven for, and one abstention.

Group F maintained that they needed a mathematics instructor,at the full or associate level, who has demonstrated research capabilities. The successful candidate would be interested in mathematics problems, such as motivation, causes of female anxiety with mathematics, and working with slow math learners. The Department recommendedthat the second position be divided into two half-time slots which would include teaching in the public schools and the university. The university focus would be on special education designed to help students and faculty meet the challenges of the mainstreaming law. The public school position would be a three year part-time staff position. The position would rotate around different school systems every three years. If someone especially qualified were found, he or she would be retained with adjunct status. This

person would help the faculty identify problems in schools and broker faculty competencies with school interests and concerns.

Group H provided the following job descriptions. Assistant Professor of mathematics education, Ph.D. or Ed.D. required. Good research skills and proposal writing experience are necessary. Position would involve teaching graduates and undergraduates in mathematics education, assuming responsibility for proposal writing, and assisting faculty in R & D activites. The second job description called for an Assistant Professor of Business Education, doctorate required, to teach courses in business education and develop and coordinate a field services office for the Department.

Revisions

Only one Group, D and E, revised its response. The revision was more an explanation or rationale than a change from the original position. One comment during the review of the case studies was that the position described in the memoranda encompassed too many qualifications for one faculty member. This was because the overriding goals of the Department were vague. The position for the public school person was to teach a course, not to replace a full-time faculty member. There must be a full-time faculty member in the Department to bring intellectual leadership to a particular discipline.

In respect to the second position, the group maintained that, rather than attacking the dual question of the replacement of a retiring faculty and developing new goals for the department on a piecemeal basis, they now recommend that Professor Nolan's position not be filled immediately. Instead, the dollars attached to that position should be placed in a pool for the training of remaining faculty members to be more responsive to the needs of the public schools and the needs of the department in general. The Dean would have to understand that

the budget must be flexible enough to have previous staff dollars assigned to internal research and development. The money might be used to release each faculty member to spend some time in the schools.

Analysis

It is interesting that in all groups one of the replacements was a mathematics professor. Moreover, the skills for this position are quite consistent across groups. All of the groups desired individuals with strong research skills (including demonstrated ability to acquire grants and contracts), ability to identify educational problems at the school level, initiate some type of faculty development project among the faculty, and be able to work with the field. Strong emphasis was not placed on teaching or programmatic development skills.

Part of the reason why these qualifications are so similar may be that the range of skills needed by the department are severely constrained and therefore radical positions among the recommendations or revisions would be unlikely. It may also be that the increasing importance of practical-based research has affected the type of individual universities are seeking. It almost seems that the ability to bring in outside funds has surpassed scholarship, which at one time was the first priority in hiring. On the more optimistic side, it is encouraging that one of the abilities sought by the departments was problem identification.

Task II

> The enrollments at the masters level have declined precipitously over the past several years. The department has decided to initiate a new program that will attract a larger number of students to offset the downward spiral of instrucational units, a trend that many in the department see as a threat to the continued existence of their unit.

Task II (Cont.)

> The task today is to identify two choices of "new programs" that the department might consider developing. At the close of the meeting, the department should have a description of the two programs, what needs they might serve, and how they might serve to advance the R & D goals of the college and the university.

Initial Recommendations

Group A proposed to design clusters of courses pointed toward specific needs of identifiable populations, e.g., teachers, educational specialists in hospitals, social workers. These clusters of courses would be short courses, full-term courses, week-end courses, etc., which would be offered for credit but would not necessarily be applicable to degree programs. If students wanted to apply this credit to a degree program they would have to petition.

Group B began with the rationale that the instructional unit production of the department is appropriate for the size of the department in a major R & D university. Thus, the programs they created will not necessarily impact on IU's. More than likely they would impact favorably on revenue from indirect costs (Table III), consultation (Table IV), and may eventually result in growth in graduate enrollment.

The members of the Department should examine their use of research and development time and apportion a substantial amount to: 1) a program of direct aid to a selected school-community area, which would provide a research base for the department and resources to the school-community; and 2) a long term program of human resource development for school and community persons (i.e.,

social service agents, religious leaders, parents, etc.) in problem identification and inquiry.

Group C also began by asserting that the department's R & D goals were consistent with those of the College and therefore fit with the instructional unit goals. Assuming this, the group suggested a program at the graduate level aimed at providing an interdisciplinary base for teachers working with adolescent students in middle schools. This would meet the needs of the many schools moving into or having moved into a middle school organization. The second program wasa series of short-term highly focused mini-courses aimed at filling the needs expressed by teachers. These courses need not necessarily lead to a master's degree but might be applicable.

Group F described five alternative programs. The suggestions were: 1) to arrange a contract with a medium-to-large nearby school system to help on-site professionals address significant problems. (It was expected that the problems needing attention included: mainstreaming, drug use, discipline, motivation, and reading. Although the department did not have strengths in these areas, it was assumed that department members working with colleagues in other disciplines (e.g., health education, educational psychology, etc.) could organize as teams and also enrich their own preparation ; 2) to work for outside funding in the areas of bilingual education, Dean's Grants, and Teacher Corps; 3) to service new populations,e.g., parents, social workers, etc., with non-degree programs and short courses; 4) to develop undergraduate programs in areas of shortage such as mathematics and science, and work to recruit bright young people into these specialties; and 5) to develop five year programs to train more intensively teachers going into the field.

Revisions

Revisions were made by Groups A and C. Group A had several modifications. First, they wanted to add to the memorandum an opening paragraph stating that the Department wishes to study the total educational community including unconventional settings and identify areas which possess the numbers and the willingness to participate in an educational program offered by the university. Second, they decided to contract with one or two school systems with the goal of establishing a long-term relationship with school personnel to maximize the effectiveness of beginning teachers. This could include university offered courses for supervising beginning teachers and coordinated in-service courses by the school system, cooperatively taught and developed by university faculty. An integral component of the contractual agreement would be an opportunity for research on evaluating the delivery system and research on teaching (i.e., instructional styles of beginning teachers and their impact on learning). To ensure that the process would have an impact on encouraging university faculty to cooperate with the field, the merit system would have to be modified. These modifications include reassignments of teaching assistants and graduate assistants, contracted annual review, and expenses to conventions to report findings, etc. It was essential that the faculty be involved with the process, have clearly defined roles, and know how these roles relate to normal on-campus duties.

Group C's revisions began by reaffirming that the R & D goals of the Secondary Education Department are consistent with those of the School of Education and fit with the university's goals. They proposed an in-service program at the graduate level, aimed at providing an interdisciplinary base for teachers working with adolescent students in middle schools. This program might lead to a master's degree, to certification endorsement, or be open-ended. This plan should

meet the needs of the many schools moving into or having moved into a middle school organization, if it is based on an appropriate needs study. They maintained that developing relationships with the local school district would serve as a suitable base for further, broader applications.

From an R & D standpoint, the relationship with the local school district should provide a suitable opportunity for coherent research efforts of both the "naturalistic" and "common thread" varieties while also serving the needs of students in the master's programs. The doctoral programs would benefit as well. Additionally, they proposed a series of short term, highly focused mini-courses aimed at filling the needs expressed by teachers. These courses may not necessarily lead to a master's degree but may be applicable to some degree program.

Analysis

The groups all recommended programs that provided for a cluster of courses aimed toward specific populations (teachers, social service agents, parents, etc.). These would be short courses that may not necessarily lead to degree credits. One group suggested developing an undergraduate program in areas of shortage such as mathematics and science and an intensive five year program for students going into the teaching profession.

It seems that all the groups were aware of the importance of seeking new markets. The disturbing part of these recommendations, however, is the lack of any justification or description of what skills these courses would provide or why secondary education department faculty had the appropriate expertise to offer them. Moreover, none of the groups specifically described how the research and development goals of the university would be enhanced with these programs beyond a very cursory, superficial explanation. If secondary education

departments want to attract new markets, then some type of systematic rationale should be built which would explain what they are prepared to offer and what contributions these new courses will make to the needs of new populations. Another seemingly overt omission was the development of any type of evaluation mechanism. The development of a new program should include some evaluation component, if for no other purpose than to provide for some short range planning decisions (e.g., hiring of faculty, space allocations, etc.).

Task III

The Farragut School Board has called the Department to seek the advice of its members concerning two problems that it is facing. Farragut is a medium sized midwestern city that is primarily an industrial town with a large number of minorities in the community. The schools are not well supported by the public, and the financial straits of the schools are emphasized with the usual hassles over busing, mainstreaming, teacher organizations that all schools are facing. The two problems are the following:

a. The state mandated competency assurance program that was put into place this spring has yielded an unacceptable "failure" rate of approximately 40 percent for high school seniors. As could be expected, the failure rate is higher for boys than for girls, and much higher for blacks than for whites. What efforts could the department mount to help the schools ameliorate this problem?

b. The Farragut school district is establishing middle schools to be opened next Spring. The middle school decision was based as much upon problems with school closings, meeting federal guidelines for racial balance in schools, and issues of costs rather than on educational philosophy. The district would like to provide an in-service education program for the 50 teachers who have been selected to staff the middle school. How could the Department respond to this request?

Please write a prospectus that could be presented to the Farragut Board of Education in the name of the Department which might represent a realistic effort on the Department's behalf to assist in addressing these requests.

Initial Recommendations

Group B planned to respond to the Board of Education by placing at the service of Farragut direct consulting aid and a long term program in problem identification and inquiry. The first suggestion would deal with immediate problems, the second program would be designed to provide an in-depth examination of the problems. In return for the direct consulting program, the university would expect open access to the school-community as a research base, cooperation in seeking funding for formal proposals, and the exploration of formal, contractual arrangements for sharing of resources.

Group C began by describing some of the parameters that would limit the activities of the university. First, it is unlikely that the school will be willing to pay very much for any type of services. Therefore, the program will not be a serious revenue producing venture, at least at the outset. Second, the "failure" of the existing programs was established by the state and the university accepts the state's criteria for "failure." Third, the teachers are "under the gun" regarding minimal competencies and are likely to oppose university intervention unless it can be made clear that the Department will not be acting as a "hatchet" squad.

Before a program can be developed, the Department will have to take a position about the minimum competency criteria. If the Department accepts the criteria

it can move ahead. If the members refuse to accept the criteria, they can go on with the project, in spite of concerns about the criteria, or refuse to participate in a process to achieve results which the Department cannot support. Group C assumed that they accepted the criteria. A second condition the Department requested was an agreement with the Board of the Farragut district that they would have access to students, faculty, administration, and community representatives. The Department must be assured that the Board accepts the problem and believes the situation can be remedied.

In reference to solving the problem, the Department faculty should look at the total system to identify where the problems exist. It seems probable that the faculty would be most comfortable in working with the teachers on this matter, but it is imperative that they examine the entire school community. Since the problem appears to be systemic, it seems likely that interdisciplinary teams will have to be employed. This premise suggests that the Secondary Education Department will have to call upon other departments, such as Educational Administration, Special Education, etc. The faculty working on the problem must convince the Board that it is necessary that a group be formed composed of all the constituencies involved with the school. This plan may lead to ancillary activities such as "parenting" or ethnographic studies. While there is a need for mutual commitment on the part of the Board and the university, the faculty can only assure the Board that they will work with them; they cannot "do" for them. From the standpoint of the Department, time should be used for building long term relationships with the school system that will be mutually profitable and contribute to the health of the Department rather than be a drain on already meager resources.

Relating to the second issue, the Department assumed that the problem was

correctly identified as a secondary education problem, however, they reserve the privilege of using resources from elementary education. The first premise the Group stated was that an in-service program for middle school teachers should grow out of the results of the assessment described in the first problem. Moreover, the solution to this problem will probably be resolved when the first problem is solved. Faculty working on this problem should understand the organizational and student needs of the middle school as opposed to the junior high school. While it is important that the local situation be studied in order to devise a sound in-service program, there is an area where the Department expertise can be of immediate service. Specifically, the Department has the expertise to work with children of this age in school situations.

In summary, the Department must be able to include a research component in the development of a long term relationship with the Farragut school system. The Department should be able to pursue research in the naturalistic mode, to the mutual benefit of the school district, university, and ultimately the broader community the university serves. These problems are sufficiently widespread that the faculty should not overlook the opportunity to generalize beyond the immediate situation. This would offer an opportunity to involve other units of the school of education, thus strengthening the school. (The revisions of Group C were minor clarifications of the original concepts. These have been included as part of the original memoranda, since there were no substantive changes.).

Group G responded to both requests from the public schools by asking a series of questions for each program: Program One - Can the Department deal with a problem that is so broadly based? Is the definition of "cut-off" unrealistic and isn't it an administrative problem? Can a team of experts be organized to deal with this complex problem? Will state funds be supplied to supplement the

Department's efforts? Should present courses be focused on school problems? Should the Department accelerate the training of students in education for the disadvantaged? Program Two - What is the purpose of the reorganization? Can the Department enlist these teachers into the programs? What research considerations will be enhanced by this project? Does the Department really want to get involved in this project? Will the program meet the needs of the school district? What are the teacher training needs in light of the new school? What kind of pressure will the union place on the program? What is the mission of the new middle school? And finally, before initiating any program, the faculty need to confer with the important others in the school system.

Revisions

Group B's initial recommendation remained the same. The second meeting was used to discuss techniques and organizational relationships among university secondary education personnel, school district personnel and community representatives (whose agendas coincide with the two other organizationally defined tasks).

Group C's revisions were relatively specific in scope. They suggested providing immediate help to the school district as well as planning for a long range development program. The faculty working with the school system should include team members from several disciplines and service components, legal, medical, etc. A lab school should be created that would involve school personnel as well as graduate students, and junior faculty. Finally, the intervention should go beyond consultation with the administration.

Analysis

The group recommendations for this task are encouraging with respect to

problem identification and building opportunities for field-based research. All of the groups maintained that the problems in the school system were probably systemic and would therefore require an intensive examination of the actors and organizational context. Furthermore, the groups seem to indicate that the problems would probably require an interdisciplinary focus. In addition to this interdisciplinary focus, one of the groups suggested that new methodological techniques might be useful in discovering the source of the problems and identigying solutions for remedying the situation. All of the groups recognized the long range benefits for cooperating with school districts, both in terms of research and service possibilities.

There does seem to be, however, one prevailing attitude among the group recommendations that may lead to some problems in working with school districts. It seems that some of the group responses required the school district to make several concessions before the Department would consider working with them. This does not seem to be an unreasonable request, providing that the university faculty are also willing to make some assertions about what they can accomplish within a school setting. The dilemma presented by a school board seeking assistance from a reluctant Department of Education must be seriously studied by deans and department heads. Problems concerning secondary education <u>are</u> the responsibility of the Secondary Education Department. If universities and school systems are going to continue to work on solving problems, it will have to be accomplished through conscious endeavors on both parts to communicate expectations, responsibilities, and limitations.

Task IV

There is some disgruntlement in the Department about how promotions have been handled in the past. The last promotion to full professor in the Department was in 1973 when Professor Higgins was advanced. The Department chair feels that the younger professors may not realize the norms of the university vis-a-vis "getting promoted" and wants the faculty at this meeting to decide on the criteria that should be used at the Department level to identify those who should be recommended for promotion. Starting from scratch, and forgetting entirely the current procedures of the Department, the faculty at this meeting are asked to propose a procedure including a set of criteria that would be helpful for the Department.

Initial Recommendations

The combined Group D and E began the establishment of criteria for promotion in the Department with a series of assumptions: 1) the university does not have procedures which hold for all schools; 2) the criteria established by the College of Education, and this department in particular, will be examined by a university-wide committee of deans and faculty; 3) the promotion criteria will reflect the goals which the Department considers to be most important in its work for the next ten years; 4) the Department is fully cognizant of the dearth of promotions in the past five years, and feels that the present criteria need a complete review; and 5) all faculty members in this department are responsible for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Criteria for Promotion

A. Research

1. Demonstration that a faculty member can complete independent research beyond the dissertation
2. Substantial publication record
3. Appropriate advising of doctoral students

B. Teaching and Advising

1. Design of evaluation instruments for his own courses and the reaction to his work by students using these instruments.
2. Peer review of teaching is optional but not required

3. Hold regular office hours with some determination tied to the number of students formally advised

C. Service

1. Participation in the outreach programs created by the new faculty members

2. Participation in professional organizations

3. Evaluation by the public school constituency now served by the Department

The vote by the group on this criteria was unanimous.

Group G submitted an outline suggestive of the issues which need to be addressed in future meetings.

A. Criteria at the Department level to identify faculty for promotion: (These should also be specified and different for assistant and associate professor.)

1. Teacher effectiveness

2. Scholarly activity

3. Service activity

B. Implementing the Criteria

1. R & D money should be included in promotion criteria

2. Outside reviews should be done including foundations and other funding agencies

3. The procedure for the decision should have open information, recommendations, vote, and oppose quota systems at the department or the college level

4. Department needs should be weighed in the criteria

5. The Faculty and Dean should confer over promotion criteria

Group H prepared a memorandum to the Dean

MEMORANDUM TO THE DEAN

FROM: Chairperson, Secondary Division

As you know, we have had some dissatisfaction with the promotion procedures

of the department. A number of factors are involved. These are:

1. Whether the present criteria are clearly stated and understandable.

2. Whether the "rules of the game" have changed or are in the process of changing to meet the conflict between

   a. College expectations of teaching, research and publications, and service.

   b. Central administration expectations which focus on visibility at the national level and obtaining outside funding. (This usually means increased focus on research and publications.)

3. It seems that we need to do more in-service programs to increase sagging enrollments.

4. We do have a large group of associate professors who are not as productive as perhaps they could be. They claim to either not understand or to not agree with present procedures. Thus, we need to hold out both the carrot and the stick.

There are a host of problems involved in this entire process. Nevertheless, we propose the following:

1. Re-orient the thinking of faculty to view field work and in-service functions more positively and to encourage them to use the in-service, field work functions as the basis for empirical research.

2. Differential staffing may be used with individuals tending to have a special function in addition to other responsibilities. That is, over a period of several years an individual would carry out all functions seen as necessary for promotion in the department.

3. We need to convey to the central administration changing times that are making us re-orient our functions.

4. Criteria need to be made explicit and involve the faculty in review of dossiers for promotion. Individuals need to be made aware of deficiencies.

Criteria:

1. Quality of publications in refereed journals (Are they research or <u>empirically</u> based--as opposed to philosophical? Is this understood as part of the promotion criteria?)

2. Quality of teaching. (How should the quality of teaching be assessed? Should there be student assessment? peer assessment?)

3. Quality of fieldwork and service (Should they be an equal criteria for promotion?)

4. Quantity and quality of contracts and grants (is the ability to get outside funding a criterion for promotion?)

Some Questions:

1. Can we combine some functions? e.g., research involving classroom teachers coming out of field work?

2. Can faculty decide which criteria they want to meet? Different groups of individual faculty can choose their main thrust and not have to meet all criteria; however, if individual faculty choose, they tend to exploit their "thing" and minimize other functions.

3. How can fair criteria be obtained? Given the nature of University as an R & D institution we must be sure those people have an impact beyond local areas, i.e., they must have national visibility.

4. Need to consider the directions being dictated by national education policies--how does this relate to obtaining federal funds--getting money for the research and thus indirect cost increments?

5. How are promotions criteria related to merit pay increase? Merit pay principle should be affirmed and considered.

6. In assessing teaching, should we look at ability of faculty to attract students to their courses, workshops, etc.?

7. How do we reestablish credibility of universities?

8. Do differential assignments pay off? Or does it simply permit people to avoid the hard criteria for promotion? In regard to criteria, there is a need for institution support services. This requires much more coordination. Need a long range plan for development.

9. Should all associate and assistant professors prepare dossier each year for full professional review?

Revisions

Group G was the only group to make revisions on this task. The Group stated that the criteria for promotion should reflect the mission and goals of the university. Second, the outside reviews should be considered differently than the objective, competitive reviews of peers and referees.

Analysis

All of the group reports identified a criteria for promotion including research, teaching, and service. The major emphasis seemed to be on the research and service components. In two reports, there were some questions regarding the importance of contract and grants awards as a criteria for promotion. There seemed to be considerable ambiguity in all the reports regarding the role and significance of field work and other service functions as a criteria for promotion. In the other tasks there also is a strong emphasis on research and field work as a criteria for hiring and as a vehicle for problem solving and program development. It therefore seems both perspicacious and prudent to question the scope and role functions of research and service in the promotion process.

Several Broad Approaches to Research Frontiers in Secondary Education

The Monday afternoon session was devoted to exploring, "Research Frontiers in Secondary Education." The panelists were selected on the bases of their interests in research on adolescents and their innovative and unique perspectives for conceptualizing problems in secondary schools. (An overview of these presentations can be found on pages 9 to 12.)

James Rosenbaum, Associate Professor, Department of Social Psychology, Yale University, maintained that we have amassed a great deal of research on educational practices. What we now need is a new awareness which examines how social issues affect educational practices. We need new understanding and departures on problems in our secondary schools. For example, studies on ability grouping have existed for a long time; however, the results are inconclusive, with some showing beneficial effects and others showing detrimental effects. We need to identify new ways and moderating variables to aid policymakers in determining effective educational practices. Several questions might be examined: how is ability grouping related to teaching? does ability grouping provide flexibility among student expectations and goals? does ability grouping produce homogeneity among students? does ability grouping affect curriculum grouping? Other old practices that could be re-examined by new criteria include: grading, compulsory attendance, class size, modular timing, and extra curricular activities.

Norman Sprintall, Professor of Psychoeducational Studies, University of Minnesota, stated that there has not been enough adequate reform in educational practices. Moreover, there has been a dearth of improvement research because

scholars have been reluctant to pursue high risk studies. Research on achievement has not been related to success in life. We need studies that examine the full array of life experiences that affect human development. The secondary school curricula should be organized to help students understand themselves in order to free them to help others. In helping others, they conversely help themselves. New variables must be identified to indicate psycho-maturity. The research setting should be in the classroom. The focus should be on how we can learn from experience.

Susan Abramowitz, Associate Director for Educational Finance at the National Institute of Education, maintained that researchers have assumed the high schools are bureaucracies and have, therefore, examined them with a preconceived organizational bias. Some of the assumptions are that schools are rigid and too large; teachers and administrators are authoritarian and non-adaptive to changes. In a recent national stratefied study by the National Institute of Education, these assumptions were seriously challenged. The survey of 2000 public and 600 private high school principals revealed that high schools absorb community demands and respond to their clientele. The administrative organization of the high schools is three tiered; principals, staff, and decision-makers. Conventional management linkages to instruction are non-existent, which seems to indicate that high schools are not as bureaucratic as originally perceived. These results imply that perhaps researchers should reconceptualize their assumptions in examining secondary schools.

Thomas Popkewitz, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin, asserted that to understand educational reform we need to view schools as sociologically constructed to reflect the dynamics of social issues. This definition would direct educational research toward the works, customs,

and traditions of school practice. Popkewitz maintains that schooling is a place of work and schools are a source of knowledge distribution. The researcher should be concerned with developing an intellectual awareness of what is occurring in this environment. This perspective offers a different conception of the context and function of schooling.

In addition to these presentations, several conferees discussed several research areas more specifically related to the organization of secondary education departments. One topic that surfaced several times referred to the issue of joint appointments. Common questions queried whether these professors are more effective than traditional appointments;what are the responsibilities of the professor to the department, and who should evaluate their performance? Another issue was compulsory attendance. Should secondary schools have compulsory attendance? What would be the effect on students and society if they came to school because they wanted to? Are there any studies which explore compulsory attendance? The last topic that conferees introduced was establishing criteria for evaluating beginning teachers and effective teaching at the college level. What constitutes an effective teacher? What mechanisms effect the socializing process for the beginning teacher? How should beginning teachers be evaluated? (This was a concern of both process and substance.)

The deans took yet another perspective on the issues. Some of the deans maintained that the problems of our schools are societal problems, recognizing that curricular changes or retraining teachers will get at these problems only if very fundamental changes occurring in the lives of today's adolescents are taken into account. These changes include restructured family relationships and role responsibilities, and increasing uncertainty about individual and societal moral and social obligations. The solutions to problems will emerge by generating broad integrative approaches to important issues.

Evaluation of the Impact of the Conference on the Participants

To determine the impact of the conference, each conferee was asked to complete an evaluation form. Responses were received from seventy-five percent of the conference participants. Results are reported on reactions to the case study and the general format and substance of the conference.

Case Study Evaluation

Results revealed that there was a general consensus that the case study was a very helpful conference organizer, serving as a springboard for further discussions. The case study effectively generated concerns and problems which were not always related to the case study, but were of important interest to the participants. The small groups and task assignments provided participants with the opportunity to take part in a situation very similar to that of his/her home institution. Many suspected the "case" represented their own institution. Although the participants were from diverse backgrounds, the case study provided a focus for discussion of key problems and issues which are of concern to all Departments of Secondary Education. The tasks, according to the respondents, seemed valid and inspired creative solutions. Overall, the case study provided the initial focus and, after coming to consensus, the process gave the group the opportunity to reexamine their recommendations in light of comments and discussion in the larger group.

Overall Evaluation of the Conference

Several respondents suggested that the presence of more public school people would have been advantageous. Another suggestion was that more time for discussion and information sharing would have been beneficial. Several people mentioned that they would have liked to receive the case study prior to the conference. Several participants thought that trained leaders should

have been recruited for the small discussion sessions. Generally, however, there was a consistent expression that the conference was a good beginning and that the case study provided a valuable experience which could serve as an instructive model in all Secondary Education Departments.

Reactions to the overall conference were favorable. The case study was viewed as a helpful tool for identifying problems and solutions. For the session on "Research Frontiers," several conferees stated that the perspectives given by some of the panelists were traditional and did not offer new directions for research. Other respondents maintained that the presentations were interesting and requested bibliographies and other supplementary materials. The small dinners at the faculty homes on Monday evening were perceived by the conferees as excellent means for stimulating conversation and providing a forum for continuing discussion in an informal atmosphere. Respondents also indicated that they found the last session an excellent wrap-up of the conference proceedings.

Recommendations for Future Activities

Several conferees indicated that further discussions on the topics presented at the conference should be continued. Mechanisms for these discussions included another large conference, a series of regional meetings, and department meetings at individual institutions. A number of respondents suggested that the deans should be asked to report at some future meeting any steps their university had taken to change secondary teacher education or, more broadly, what steps are being taken to alter the mission of secondary education departments in response to societal changes. Another recommendation was to commission some individuals to write some position papers on problems in secondary education and disseminate the papers. Several of the participants maintained that next steps should be taken by the group, either on an individual basis at their own institution, or by establishing a network of secondary education faculty, including the participants at the conference.

This conference reaffirmed the Deans' Network mission of providing effective models for faculty development. Secondary education departments are faced with serious personnel problems. The predilictions of the faculty are not to do research, as sanctioned by the general research mission of the university, but to teach specific subject areas. Moreover, the service activities that faculty have and are willing to provide to local school districts are often narrow in scope and of minimum importance to the field. The implications of this are that some secondary education faculty may have to be retrained, or the morale and fiscal ramifications may threaten the viability of schools of education.

In this context, it seems that something could be done by having the deans share potential solutions. To begin the process, the Deans' Network could undertake an in-depth study of the strengths and needs of professors of secondary education and recommend and implement an intervention program of career development. For example, establish a career re-development center so that secondary education faculty might go there for short courses to learn about specific topics that would help them make career changes. Part of this re-training center would be a placement service which would assist faculty in finding positions in other areas of the university or outside of education.